

### REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are currently pending. Claims 28-30 have been added to more fully enhance the scope of patent coverage of Applicant's claimed invention. The support for claim 28 is found on page 8, lines 6-10. The support for claims 29 and 30 is found on page 13, lines 23-27. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Patent Office rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 17, and 19-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky, U.S. Patent No. 5,983,115, in view of Bamburak, U.S. Patent No. 6,807,418.

Claim 1 recites "A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station; identifying a plurality of SIDs having a common spatial characteristic; storing the identified plurality of SIDs in a memory that is accessible by a mobile station; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs; and **upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a Home service provider for the mobile station.**"

Claim 17 recites "A mobile station, comprising a controller; a wireless transceiver; and at least one memory, the at least one memory comprising a location for storing a Home SID and other locations for storing a plurality of Cousin SIDs, wherein a SID received through said wireless controller is declared by said controller to be associated with a Home service provider **if the received SID matches the stored Home SID or any one of the plurality of stored Cousin SIDs.**"

Claim 22 recites "A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a first SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of second SIDs; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of second SIDs and **upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of second SIDs, comparing the received SID to the first**

**SID and upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.”**

Mizikovsky discloses (abstract) a communication device that locates a wireless service provider in a multi-service provider environment using a stored list of preferred service providers, the list has a plurality of uniquely identified sublists, each sublist is associated with a different geographic area and identifies a more preferred service provider and a less preferred service provider. Mizikovsky discloses (col. 8, lines 36-41) the mobile communication device registers with the best stored SOC or SID, that is, an SOC or SID that has at least been associated with a preferred service provider in which the best service provider is identified by comparing the stored SOC or SIDs with the list of preferred SOC or SIDs. Mizikovsky seeks to determine if a received SID or SOC is an optimal, preferred, or prohibited service provider (col. 5, lines 57-67) and does not appear to disclose or suggest assigning a home service provider (e.g., col. 3, lines 10-18). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Mizikovsky does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). The claimed invention in claims 1, 17, and 22, recites that if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Bamburak does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed subject matter.

Thus, claims 1, 17, and 22 are not made obvious by the proposed combination of Mizikovsky and Bamburak. Further claims 2-9, 18, 19, and 25 are also not made obvious by the proposed combination of Mizikovsky and Bamburak as these claims depend from allowable claims 1, 17, or 22.

Claim 20 recites “A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing,

in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a first SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of second SIDs; comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the first SID and upon the received SID matching the first SID, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and **if the received SID does not match the first SID, comparing the received SID to the plurality of second SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.**”

As discussed above, neither Mizikovsky nor Bamburak disclose or suggest comparing the received SID to a plurality of SIDs and, if there is a match, declaring the service provider corresponding to the matched one of the plurality of SIDs to be the home category service provider. Furthermore, neither Mizikovsky nor Bamburak disclose or fairly suggest a two stage determination process in which the other stage compares the received SID with the first (or second) SID and declares a service provider corresponding to the first (or second) SID a home service provider if the first (or second) SID matches the received SID. Thus, claims 20 and 21 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Claim 24 recites “A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) and System Operator Code (SOC) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a SOC that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of SIDs; comparing a SOC received from a wireless service provider to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and **if the received SOC does not match the stored SOC, comparing a related received SID to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of second SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.**”

Claim 26 recites “A method for operating a wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) and System Operator Code (SOC) parameters to prepaid mobile stations, comprising storing, in at least one memory that is accessible by a mobile station, a SOC that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a plurality of SIDs;

comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the plurality of stored SIDs and upon the received SID matching any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, declaring the wireless service provider to be a Home category service provider for the mobile station; and **if the received SID does not match any one of the plurality of stored SIDs, comparing a received SOC to the stored SOC and upon the received SOC matching the stored SOC, declaring the wireless service provider to be the Home category service provider for the mobile station.**”

Although Bamburak discloses finding an optimal or preferred service provider by checking the SOC or SID of the last service provider and failing to find an optimal or preferred service provider, determining such by comparing the SOC or SID from the control signal with a list of optimal service provider SOC's or SIDs (col. 5, lines 40-42), Bamburak does not disclose or fairly suggest comparing a received SID with a plurality of stored SIDs in which a home category service provider is declared corresponding to the SID from the plurality of stored SIDs that matches the received SID. Neither Bamburak nor Mizikovsky disclose a two stage comparison process. Thus, claims 24-27 are not made obvious by the proposed combination of Bamburak and Mizikovsky.

The Patent Office rejected claims 4, 7, 9, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Bamburak and further in view of McGregor.

Claim 4 recites “wherein the steps of identifying, storing, comparing and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation.”

The Patent Office asserted that “McGregor teaches the steps of identifying, storing, comparing, and declaring are executed only if the mobile station is classified as being in a Prepaid mode of operation (col. 8 lines 53-55)” (page 13 lines 3-6, of the Office Action mailed September 30, 2005).

McGregor discloses a debit mode (paragraph 0223) and a no\_debit mode (paragraph 0228) but does not seem to interrelate these to any steps of identifying a plurality of SIDs, storing the identified plurality of SIDs, comparing a SID received from a wireless service provider to the stored plurality of SIDs; and upon any one of the plurality of stored SIDs matching the received SID, declaring the wireless service provider as being a home service provider for the mobile station. Furthermore, as discussed above, neither Mizikovsky nor Bamburak disclose or fairly suggest if a received SID matches one of a plurality of SIDs, then the service provider

S.N.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2643

corresponding to the matched SID from the plurality of SIDs is declared to be a home service provider for the mobile station. Thus, claim 4 is not made obvious by any combination of Mizikovsky, Bamburak, and McGregor.

Claims 7 and 9 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claims and for the reasons claim 4 is allowable.

Claim 18 recites "wherein the Cousin SIDs are stored into said memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider, and correspond to SIDs associated with one or more service providers that service a predetermined geographical area that is defined to be a non-roaming area of a customer of the prepaid service provider." McGregor's claim 25 appears to relate to a single service provider (see also paragraph 0259). Despite the Patent Office's assertions from the last two lines of page 13 through the first three lines of page 14 of the Office Action mailed September 30, 2005, none of Mizikovsky, Bamburak, and McGregor disclose or fairly suggest that the cousin SIDs are stored in memory under the direction of a prepaid service provider (e.g., see McGregor, page 3, left hand column, lines 4-6) or that the cousin SIDs service a predetermined geographical area that is defined to be a non-roaming area of a customer of the prepaid service provider. Thus, claim 18 is allowable over the prior art of record for this additional reason as well as depending from allowable base claim 17.

The Patent Office rejected claims 10 and 12-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor, U.S. Published patent application no. 2001/0000777 in view of Bamburak, U.S. Patent No. 6,807,418.

Claim 10 recites "A wireless communication system of a type that transmits System Identification (SID) parameters to mobile stations, comprising in mobile stations associated with a prepaid service provider at least one memory storing a SID that identifies a Home service provider for the mobile station and a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic, the mobile station comprising a processor that is coupled to the at least one memory and that is responsive to a received SID for comparing the received SID to the SIDs in the list of SIDs and, upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the Home service provider for the

S.N.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2643

mobile station.”

McGregor does not appear to disclose “a list containing a plurality of other SIDs having a common spatial characteristic” such that “upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the home service provider for the mobile station.” In McGregor’s claim 25, a mobile telephone unit is disclosed as having internal accounting software with a billing algorithm. In McGregor’s claim 25, there does not appear to be disclosure or fair suggestion of a SID or a plurality of SIDs. Bamburak appears to be directed to finding an optimal service provider and not a home service provider (col. 3, lines 49-52). In Bamburak, the SOC or SID of a service provider is checked to determine if the SOC or SID corresponds to an optimal service provider (col. 5, lines 25-28) via a list of a optimal SOC or SIDs (col. 6, lines 28-30). Bamburak does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest “upon any one of the plurality of SIDs matching the received SID, declaring a wireless service provider that transmitted the SID as being the home service provider for the mobile station.” Thus, claim 10 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 12 and 16 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claims.

Claims 13-15 are allowable because they depend from allowable base claims and are allowable on their own merits. As to claim 13, Bamburak does not appear to disclose an Intelligent Roaming Data Base (or IRDB). As to claim 14, Bamburak does not disclose if none of the plurality of SIDs matches the received SID, the processor then compare a received SOC to the stored SOC. As to claim 15, although McGregor’s claim 25 recites “a representation of prepaid funds,” McGregor does not appear to disclose or fairly suggest displaying a message to a user for informing the user that the user is operating in a Prepaid mode.

The Patent Office has rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGregor, in view of Bamburak and further in view of Mizikovsky.

Claim 11 is allowable because it depends from allowable base claim 10.

New claims 28-30 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record at least because of their dependency from allowable base claims, and on their own merits.

S.N.: 09/965,784  
Art Unit: 2643

The Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and remove the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Mizikovsky, Bamburak, and/ or McGregor, and to allow all of the pending claims 1-30 as now presented for examination. An early notification of the allowability of claims 1-30 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted:

Walter J. Malinowski      December 20, 2005  
Walter J. Malinowski      Date  
Reg. No.: 43,423

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP  
4 Research Drive  
Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203)925-9400, extension 19  
Facsimile: (203)944-0245  
email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

12-20-05      Ann Oleniowich  
Date      Name of Person Making Deposit